



The Murtadd OTE

Sixteen years ago, the murtadd leaders of apostate organizations in the West – including Nihad Awad (CAIR), Sami al-Arian (WISE), and their likes – called upon congregations belonging to the various “mosques” of America to participate in the pagan rites of the US presidential election of “2000.” These claimants of political awareness went as far as campaigning for the Republican Party – one of the two major sects of American paganism – and its then presidential nominee, George W. Bush. They justified their active support of Bush with his election promises, as during the election campaign, Bush had criticized Clinton’s interventionism in Somalia, denounced the usage of secret evidence against Arab Americans, and portrayed himself as a “compassionate conservative” who would aid minorities and strengthen “faith-based and community” organizations. He even had stated, “I don’t think our troops ought to be used for what’s called nation-building,” as well as, “If we don’t stop extending our troops all around the world in nation-building missions, then we’re going to have a serious problem coming down the road. And I’m going to prevent that”!¹

¹ The murtadd imams of the West applauded Bush for his criticism of Clinton’s interventionism while realizing that Bush’s words were generally directed towards Clinton’s policy in the Balkans, a policy for which they themselves had rallied despite knowing very well that Clinton would only get involved therein for the same reason he had done so in Somalia – the fear of jihad arising and spreading. This attitude from the murtadd imams is not surprising, consid-



George W. Bush with his murtadd supporters

In addition to Bush's hypocritical promises, the murtadd imams privately propagated superstitious conspiracy theories, claiming that if Al Gore won, the American Jewish lobby would collaborate with the Mossad to assassinate Gore, and thus, the US would be run by its first Jewish president, Joe Lieberman. Hence, they proved their political naivety, for what difference was there between Lieberman and Bush? Bush's running mate – the neoconservative, pro-“Israel” Dick Cheney – was an advisory board member of a major pro-“Israel” American think tank, the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA), before becoming vice president, and, in “1991,” was presented with its annual “Distinguished Service Award” for his career dedication to pro-“Israel” American national security, a history he has shared with the hawkish Jew Lieberman. So why would the Jewish lobby, the Jewish state, or the Mossad need to assassinate Al Gore to have American politicians further serve Jewish interests?²

Yet despite the self-imposed naivety of the murtadd imams of the West, they were supported in their campaign for Bush by the apostate Safar al-Hawali, author of scholarly treatises exposing secularism, Irja, and the Christian fundamentalist foreign policy of the US, treatises purportedly demonstrating his “knowledge” of creed and current affairs. Instead, he proved himself just as deviant and absurd as his brethren, the imams of the West who would not recognize that Bush, Gore, and

ering they fear jihad even more than the Crusaders do. Also, one would expect that the so-called “non-interventionist,” American kuffar would have realized, after their experiences with both Bush and Obama, that Donald Trump's similar election promises have no weight, especially after his meetings with AIPAC and Netanyahu and the recent release of his pro-“Israel” policy plan rendering him equal to his rival, Clinton, in foreign policy and international relations.

2 Likewise, George W. Bush, John McCain, Donald Trump, Barack Obama, Bill and Hillary Clinton, Joe Lieberman, Joe Biden, John Kerry, and so forth are all supporters of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC). So how can the murtadd imams of the West claim there is any real difference for Muslims between the various US presidential nominees and candidates?

Lieberman were essentially the same in their enmity towards Islam and the Muslims. Then, when the blessed September 11th operations were executed, al-Hawali wrote “An Open Letter to President Bush,” in which he reminded Bush of the murtadd favor, saying, “We Muslims desired to see you elected and we have proof that the votes which gave you victory were our votes, and I personally advised Muslims to vote for you.”

Yes, sadly in “2000,” in the “swing state” of Florida, one of the US states with the largest percentage of “Muslims” and the greatest number of “mosques,” Bush achieved 537 more popular votes than Gore, allowing him to secure Florida's 25 electoral votes, and thereby mount the presi-

dential chair, with approximately 80 percent of murtadd Americans nationwide supporting him. Thus, in addition to committing the apostasy of democratic voting, they share in the crimes committed by Bush against Islam and the Muslims throughout his eight years of rule.

The murtadd voters, however, did not learn, as by “2008,” Obama got up to 90 percent of their vote. And after almost thirty years of history proving to the entire world that there is no difference between the American Republican and Democratic parties in their policies against Islam and Muslims, the murtadd imams of the so-called “Muslim Brotherhood” and its sister sects continue to advocate voting in the pagan festivals of US democracy, this time campaigning for the Democratic Party and its presidential nominee, Hillary Clinton. They refuse to see that Obama interfered – both directly and indirectly – against the interests of Muslims just as Bush senior, Bill Clinton, and Bush junior had done before him. Obama invaded Iraq and Sham, backed the Jewish state and Arab tyrants, interfered in Libya (fearing the arising and spreading of jihad, just as Clinton had done in the Balkans), continued Bush's drone strikes and proxy wars in Yemen, Afghanistan, and Somalia, and preserved Guantanamo Bay, breaking almost every election promise he had made, something that both Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton would undoubtedly do just as their predecessors had done before them.

Also, after both Trump and Clinton committed themselves to the Jewish state and the war against Islam (especially through their vows to continue the war against the body of Islam, the Khilafah), the only differences between Trump and Clinton are that Clinton is more skilled in “political correctness,” giving her leverage in the sorcery of hypocrisy, that she is a female feminist – and the Prophet ﷺ said, “Never shall a people who give their leadership to a woman be successful” (Reported by al-Bukhari from Abu Bakrah) – and that Trump is impulsive and unpredictable. As for their stances on “Islam” and the “Muslims,” then Clinton's doublespeak is meant to spellbind nationalist “Muslims” and liberal “Islam,”

for she wants to secure the murtadd vote and believes that American “Islam” is a project that can be projected to other countries, thereby leading more Muslims astray towards apostasy and eternal Hellfire. Allah ﷻ said, “Never will the Jews or the Christians approve of you until you follow their religion. Say, ‘Indeed, the guidance of Allah is the guidance.’ And if you were to follow their desires after what has come to you of knowledge, you would have against Allah no protector or helper” (Al-Baqarah 120). He ﷻ also said, “They will continue to fight you until they turn you back from your religion if they are able. And whoever of you apostatizes from his religion and dies while he is a disbeliever – their deeds, indeed, have become worthless in this world and the Hereafter; and they are the companions of Hellfire, abiding therein eternally” (Al-Baqarah 217). As for Trump, then he has yet to learn that what he refers to as “radical Islamic terrorism” is nothing but the teachings of Islam, plain and simple. No adjective needs to precede Islam to describe the just terror it incites, as Allah ﷻ said, “Prepare against them whatever you are able of power and of steeds of war by which you may terrorize the enemy of Allah and your enemy” (Al-Anfal 60).

Meanwhile, as the US presidential election day draws nearer, it becomes necessary to remind others what the shar’i ruling on partaking in the rituals of democracy is and that this ruling remains the same whether or not one of the two candidates is “the lesser of the two evils” or even a murtadd pclaimant of “Islam.”

Allah ﷻ ordered His slaves to worship and submit to Him alone and commanded them to disassociate from taghut and disbelieve in it. “Whoever disbelieves in taghut and believes in Allah has grasped the most trustworthy handhold with no break in it. And Allah is Hearing and Knowing” (Al-Baqarah 256). “And We certainly sent into every nation a messenger, [saying], ‘Worship

Allah and disassociate from taghut” (An-Nahl 36). The Prophet ﷺ explained this, saying, “Islam has been built upon five matters: Worshiping Allah and disbelieving in anything [worshiped] besides Him...” (Reported by Muslim from Ibn ‘Umar).

Taghut linguistically is from the Arabic root tagha, meaning to transgress the limits. This limit – in the context of the Quran and the Sunnah – is Allah’s tawhid, the taghut thus being anyone and anything by which Allah’s unique attributes and sole right to be worshiped are transgressed upon. From the pillars of Allah’s tawhid is that He alone has the right to legislate. Hence, the execution of, judgment by, and seeking judgment from any legislation besides His are major shirk. The evidences for this from the Quran and the Sunnah are explicit and plenteous.³ “Have you not seen those who claim to have believed in what was revealed to you, and what was revealed before you? They wish to seek judgment from taghut, while they were commanded to disbelieve in it; and Shaytan wishes to lead them far astray” (An-Nisa 60). “Do they have ‘partners’ [whom they associate with Allah] who have legislated for them of religion that which Allah has not permitted?” (Ash-Shura 21). “Those who do not rule by what Allah has revealed are indeed the disbelievers” (Al-Maidah 44).

Accordingly, human legislators, manmade laws, modern constitutions, judges who rule thereby, and rulers who enforce such upon others are all tawaghit whom the Muslim must disassociate from and disbelieve in. In this regards, Ibnul-Qayyim ﷺ said, “Allah ﷻ informed that anyone who seeks judgment from or rules by anything other than the Shari’ah of Muhammad ﷺ has ruled by taghut and sought judgment from it. Taghut is anything

3 See, in the upcoming issue 3 of Rumiya, inshaallah, “The Religion of Islam and the Jama’ah of the Muslims – Part 4” and “Tawhid of Allah in His Rule.”



Hillary Clinton’s running mate courting a Jewish taghut



A murtadd voter

by which the slave transgresses the limits through worship, following, or obedience. Thus, the taghut of any people is he whom they seek judgment from other than Allah and His Messenger, or whom they worship alongside Allah, or whom they follow without guidance from Allah, or whom they obey in what they do not know to be in obedience to Allah. These are the tawaghit of the world; if you were to contemplate them and, at the same time, contemplate the condition of the people, you would see that most people have turned from the worship of Allah to the worship of taghut, from seeking judgment from Allah and His Messenger to seeking judgment from taghut, and from obeying and following Allah and His Messenger, to obeying and following taghut” (I’lam al-Muwaqqi’in).

Throughout history, legislative tawaghit existed mainly in the forms of clergies and monarchies, with their flocks and subjects worshiping them through obedience and following. It was not until democracy was innovated and practiced by the pagan Greeks and Romans that the commoner became a participant in legislation itself. The false “gods” thereby grew in number from regime and clergy members to include all voters of the citizenry, as democracy is “the rule of the people.” According to this pagan creed, the people are the ultimate judge, all power is theirs, and they alone have the right to legislate. In modern, representative democracy, the people rule by choosing delegates who represent them and their whims executively, judicially, and legislatively. This “rule of the people” is not achievable except by referring to the ballot boxes, which proclaim the people’s desires. Through the ballot boxes, laws and constitutions are legislated, to be ruled and judged by. Through the ballot boxes, candidates and nominees are selected to represent the people,

to be obeyed and followed. There is no rule for Allah ﷻ in democracy except if His law is in accordance with the desire of the people. Thus, whoever votes in the democratic system – whether or not he himself is a candidate or nominee – has made himself a taghut, a rival to Allah in rule and legislation. Whoever does this, is an apostate whether he is an open secularist or an alleged “Islamist,” as legislation is Allah’s alone and judgment is His alone, not for the people, nor the constitution of the people, nor the representatives of the people. Accordingly, the person does not disassociate from the taghut of democracy – the “people” – and disbelieve in it if he has not abandoned the democratic vote.

One of the clear-cut, agreed upon principles of iman is that to consent to kufr is kufr. Consenting to kufr encompasses calling to kufr, supporting kufr, resolving to commit kufr, promising to commit kufr, and committing kufr for any so-called religious or worldly “interest” without being truly coerced into doing so. If one understands this principle, any shubhah (doubt) produced by the devils from amongst men – including the Murtadd Brotherhood – will collapse before him.

Allah ﷻ said, “If you see those who mockingly delve in Our verses, then turn away from them until they change their conversation” (Al-An’am 68), and, “It has indeed been revealed to you in the Book that if you hear the verses of Allah being disbelieved in and mocked, then do not sit with them until they change their conversation. Indeed, you would otherwise be like them. Indeed Allah will gather the hypocrites and disbelievers in Hell all together” (An-Nisa 140). In these verses, Allah ﷻ ruled that if a believer sits silently in a gathering in which kufr is committed, he is then equal to the perpetrators of the kufr. From this verse, the scholars have derived the principle that “ar-rida bil-kufr kufr” (consenting to kufr is kufr). If someone apostatizes by merely sitting silently in a gathering of kufr while claiming to hate the kufr being committed, then what of the one who actively participates in the kufr? Worse yet, what of the one who actively makes himself a taghut – a rival to Allah in legislation, judgment, and rule – by voting in the democratic system, thus partaking in “the rule of the people” and transgressing upon Allah’s tawhid!

Allah ﷻ also said, “Have you not considered those who practice [major] hypocrisy, saying to their brothers who have disbelieved among the People of the Scripture, ‘If you are expelled, we will surely leave with you, and we will never obey anyone against you; and if you are fought, we will surely aid you.’ But Allah testifies that they are liars. If they are expelled, they will not leave with them, and if they are fought, they will not aid them. And even if they were to aid them, they would surely turn their backs; then they would not be supported” (Al-Hashr 11-12). In these verses, Allah ﷻ judged that those who make false promises to aid the kuffar sometime in the future against the Muslims have committed immediate kufr. In other verses, He ﷻ explained that they commit kufr even if only promising to partially obey the kuffar in kufr, saying, “Indeed, those who apostatized after guidance had become clear to them – Shaytan enticed them

and prolonged their hope. That is because they said to those who disliked what Allah sent down, ‘We will obey you in part of the matter.’ And Allah knows what they conceal” (Muhammad 25-26). If they had apostatized by merely doing the aforementioned deed, how much worse of an apostate is he who makes himself a taghut by voting and thereby claiming “the power of the people”? Allah ﷻ ended the story of the hypocrites in Surat al-Hashr, saying, “[The hypocrites are] like the example of Shaytan when he says to man, ‘Disbelieve.’ But when he disbelieves, he says, ‘Indeed, I am disassociated from you. Indeed, I fear Allah, Lord of the worlds’” (Al-Hashr 17). Likewise is the case of the alleged “Islamist” voter, as he delegates someone to commit kufr on his behalf and in his name, and then ridiculously claims he is innocent of the kufr that his delegate commits thereafter through his vote!

Allah ﷻ also said, “Have you not seen those who claim to have believed in what was revealed to you, and what was revealed before you? They wish to seek judgment from taghut, while they were commanded to disbelieve in it; and Shaytan wishes to lead them far astray” (An-Nisa 60). In this verse, Allah ﷻ negates the iman of those who merely wish to seek judgment from taghut, never mind those who have actually done so. How much worse then is he who makes himself a taghut, by making ultimate and absolute judgment for himself and all other voters, who altogether are the taghut of any democratic nation? If he claims that he does so only intending “good,” then he is like the hypocrites mentioned in the aforementioned verse, as Allah ﷻ describes them thereafter, saying, “So how [will it be] when calamity strikes

them because of what their hands have put forth and then they come to you swearing by Allah, ‘We intended nothing but good and concord’” (An-Nisa 62).

Allah ﷻ also said, “Those who believe fight for the cause of Allah, and those who disbelieve fight for the cause of taghut. So fight against the awliya [supporters] of Shaytan. Indeed, the plot of Shaytan has ever been weak” (An-Nisa 76). In this verse, Allah ﷻ pronounces takfir upon those who fight for the cause of taghut. How much worse are the tawaghit themselves for whom the disbelievers fight, the tawaghit of democracy being the voters to whom judgment is referred in all fundamental matters.

Allah ﷻ also said, “Whoever disbelieves in Allah after his belief... except for one who is forced [to renounce his religion] while his heart is secure in faith. But those who open their breasts to disbelief, upon them is wrath from Allah, and for them is a great punishment” (An-Nahl 106). The mufassirin reported that this first verse was revealed regarding ‘Ammar Ibn Yasir ؓ and other Muslims of Makkah who were severely tortured into cursing the Prophet ﷺ and praising the idols of the mushrikin. This is the only exception legislated by Allah ﷻ for someone to commit kufr. As for doing so to secure a worldly interest, then the next verse clarifies that such does not exclude the perpetrator from takfir. “That is because they preferred the worldly life over the Hereafter and that Allah does not guide the disbelieving people” (An-Nahl 107).

Allah ﷻ also said, “O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as awliya [allies]. They are awliya of one another. Whoever among you takes



Donald Trump courting Jews at the AIPAC convention



A murtadd supporting Hillary Clinton and the taghut constitution

them as awliya, then, indeed, he is one of them. Indeed, Allah guides not the oppressive people. Yet you see those in whose hearts is disease hastening to associate with them, saying, ‘We are afraid a misfortune may strike us.’ But soon Allah will bring conquest or a decree from Him, and they will become regretful over what they have been concealing within themselves” (Al-Maidah 51-52). In these verses, although the hypocrites attempt to justify their major hypocrisy with the fear of the kuffar gaining the upper hand, Allah ﷻ does not excuse them because their fear did not entail coercion according to the limits set by the Shari’ah. Accordingly, one who votes in the democratic system is an apostate, even if he fears that the victory of one candidate or nominee will lead to the deportation and abuse of Muslims, as coercion recognized by the Shari’ah in the case of kufr is unbearable torture, lethal execution, and the kuffar realistically threatening to commit such torture and execution immediately to the subjugated Muslim, as is manifest in the story of ‘Ammar Ibn Yasir ؓ. Fear of deportation and abuse is not coercion. Also, if supporting the Jews and Christians is apostasy, how much worse is supporting their tawaghit or oneself becoming a taghut by voting and thus consenting to “the rule of the people” shared by all voters?

Moreover, the obligation upon a person if he is indeed coerced is hijrah; he is not excused for kufr committed due to coercion as long as he is able to perform hijrah. Allah ﷻ said, “Indeed, those [people] whose souls the angels seize while they were wronging themselves – [the angels] will say, ‘In what condition were you?’ They will say, ‘We were subjugated in the land.’ The angels will say, ‘Was not Allah’s earth spacious [enough] for you to emigrate therein?’ Indeed, their refuge is Hell – and what a horrible destination it is” (An-Nisa 97). Ibn ‘Abbas ؓ narrated – as reported by at-Tabari – that this verse was

revealed regarding some subjugated Muslims of Makkah who concealed their Islam but later increased mushrik ranks during the battle of Badr until some of these subjugated persons were killed by arrows shot at them by the Muslim army. Members of the Muslim army then said, “These companions of ours were Muslims, but coerced, so ask forgiveness from Allah for them.” Then Allah ﷻ revealed this verse, indicating those killed were not excused “except for the subjugated among men, women, and children who are unable to escape and know not the path [for travel]. It is those whom Allah could pardon, and Allah is ever Pardoning and Forgiving” (An-Nisa 98-99). If they were not excused for merely increasing the enemy ranks without actually fighting the Prophet ﷺ and his companions ؓ, how much worse than them is he who makes himself a taghut to be obeyed and followed instead of Allah by voting in the democratic system!

Allah ﷻ also said, “Indeed, for Allah is the pure religion. And those who take protectors besides Him [claim], ‘We do not worship them except that they bring us closer to Allah in position.’ Indeed, Allah will judge between them concerning that over which they differ. Indeed, Allah does not guide he who is a liar and severe disbeliever” (Az-Zumar 3). He ﷻ also said, “We have indeed destroyed what surrounds you of cities, and We have diversified the signs that perhaps they might repent. Why then did those whom they worshiped besides Allah – intending thereby to draw closer to Him – not aid them? But they indeed failed them. That was their falsehood and that which they had fabricated” (Al-Ahqaf 27-28). These verses indicate that the mushrikin would commit their shirk seeking a religious “interest” – to get closer to Allah ﷻ – as they thought that they could not do so except through their idols, who symbolized their

ascetic, charitable, hospitable, and religious ancestors. This good intention of wanting to come closer to Allah did not excuse them from takfir when they committed various forms of shirk, including seeking intercession from the absent and dead. Likewise, one who votes and thereby joins the taghut of democracy while claiming to support “Islam” is not exempted from takfir.

These verses and others prove that the “Muslim” voter is a murtadd taghut, whose blood is obligatory to spill unless he repents. Furthermore, if the passive members of the apostate resistance to zakah were murtaddin merely for consenting willingly to the kufr of their tribes without actively fighting the Sahabah ﷺ, how much worse are those apostates who actively join the body of voters who altogether form the taghut for any democratic nation?

In this context, it is important that any murtadd who apostatized by resolving to vote in the democratic system repent and contemplate the obligation upon him towards its taghut, the obligation upon him being the Millah of Ibrahim ﷺ, as Allah ﷻ said, “We revealed to you to follow the religion of Ibrahim, inclining toward truth; and he was not of the mushrikin” (An-Nahl 123). This Millah was described in other verses, including, “There has been for you an excellent example in Ibrahim and those with him, when they said to their people, ‘Indeed, we are disassociated from you and from whatever you worship besides Allah. We denounce your kufr. And enmity and animosity have forever emerged between us and you until you believe in Allah alone’” (Mumtahanah 4). Allah ﷻ ordered the Prophet ﷺ do the same, in Surat al-Kafirun, saying, “Say, ‘O disbelievers! I do not worship what you worship. Nor do you worship what I worship. Nor do I worship in the manner you worship. Nor do you worship in the manner I worship. You have your religion and I have mine!’” This last verse means, “You have your false, corrupt religion of kufr, and I have my true, pure religion of Islam, both of them having nothing to do with each other,” like the verse, “If they deny you, then say, ‘You have your own deeds and I have mine. You are disassociated from what I do and I am disassociated from what you do’” (Yunus 41). Hence, Surat al-Kafirun was referred to as “the bara’ah from shirk” in various ahadith and athar. Abul-Jawza ﷺ (d. 83AH) likewise said, “Read Surat al-Kafirun much and declare your bara’ah from the kuffar thereby” (Ad-Durr al-Manthur).

When the Prophet ﷺ carried out these divine orders, thereby emulating Ibrahim ﷺ, the mushrikin complained, saying, “He has belittled our wise men, insulted our forefathers, disgraced our religion, broken our nation, and cursed our gods.” Some of them then interrogated him, asking him if he indeed belittled them, their religion, and their idols, to which he ﷺ replied, “Yes, I am the one who says so.” And when they continued opposing him and his religion, he said to them, “Do you not hear, O gathering of Quraysh? I swear by Him in whose hand the soul of Muhammad is, I have come to you with slaughter” (Reported by Ahmad and Ibn Hibban from ‘Abdullah Ibn ‘Amr). And just as Ibrahim ﷺ

secretly smashed the idols of his people while not having consolidation, the Prophet ﷺ did the same secretly – before the hijrah – when the opportunity arose (Reported by Ahmad, Ibn Hibban, al-Hakim, and ad-Diya from ‘Ali) and would continue smashing idols, doing so openly, without delay, after the establishment of the prophetic state.

Accordingly, the muwahhidin should say to the modern mushrikin: O disbelievers, we do not worship “the people.” We worship only the Lord of all peoples. Indeed, we are disassociated from you and from “the people” you worship besides Allah. We denounce your democratic kufr. Enmity and animosity have forever emerged between us and you until you disbelieve in “the people” and believe in Allah alone. Indeed, we have come to slaughter you and smash your ballot boxes. Such words are bara’ah upon the tongue.

The ultimate manifestation of bara’ah from shirk, however, is to kill the tawaghit and imams of kufr. “Those who believe fight for the cause of Allah, and those who disbelieve fight for the cause of taghut. So fight against the awliya of Shaytan. Indeed, the plot of Shaytan has ever been weak” (An-Nisa 76). “And if they break their oaths after their pact and defame your religion, then fight the leaders of kufr until they might cease, for indeed, there are no oaths [sacred] to them” (At-Tawbah 12). This bara’ah is what the Prophet ﷺ manifested in his military and covert operations against Allah’s enemies.

Hence, as it is clear that the voter is a part of the taghut of democracy – “the power of the people” – and that the voters are directly involved in the decision making process by choosing delegates to represent them and their whims executively, judicially, and legislatively, the blood of Crusader voters is even more deserving of being spilled than the blood of Crusader combatants. The same would apply to the blood of female voters, as they are no longer mere wives serving Crusader husbands and raising cross-worshipping children, rather female voters are part of the democratic taghut that decrees the crusades to be waged against Islam and the Muslims, and are thus just as actively responsible for the Muslim blood being spilled as the male, Crusader soldier on the frontlines.⁴

May Allah ﷻ make this year’s US presidential election a dreadful calamity like no other to have struck America throughout its pathetic history. Amin.

4 Ibn Qudamah said, “If the kuffar take their women and children as shields during war, it is permissible to shoot them... It is permissible to target them whether or not there are battle engagements... If a woman stands in the ranks of the kuffar or on the walls of their fortresses and curses the Muslims or exposes her ‘awrah to them [i.e. intending to enrage them during the battle], it is permissible to deliberately shoot her... It is permissible to look at her nakedness if doing so is needed to shoot her, because this is a necessity of archery. It is also permissible to shoot her if she collects arrows for the fighters, gives them water to drink, or incites them to fight, because she thus has the ruling of a fighter” (Al-Mughni). Several of the fuqaha have mentioned similar examples as exceptions to the rule on killing women. The exception to the prohibition would be more applicable to the female voters of Crusader nations, as they are not mere fighters but part of the taghut ordering war against Islam and being worshiped besides Allah!